

DOCKET NO: 240831US3



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT & TRADEMARK OFFICE

IN RE APPLICATION OF :
MITSUO SATO ET AL. : EXAMINER: FERGUSON, M. L.
SERIAL NO: 10/626,604 :
FILED: JULY 25, 2003 : GROUP ART UNIT: 2854
FOR: PRINTER OPERABLE IN A :
DUPLEX PRINT MODE :

PROVISIONAL ELECTION

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
ALEXANDRIA, VIRGINIA 22313

SIR:

In response to the Office Action dated June 13, 2005, Applicants provisionally elect, with traverse, Group I, Subgroup a, Claims 1-22, 34-45, 46-57, 70-93, 106-117, and 124-135 for further examination on the merits in the present application.

Applicants respectfully traverse the Restriction Requirement because the PTO has not carried forward its burden of proof to establish that searching and examining the noted sets of claims would be an undue burden.

In particular, MPEP § 803 states:

If the search and examination of an entire application can be made without serious burden, the Examiner must examine it on the merits, even though it includes claims to distinct or independent inventions.


The claims of the present invention would appear to be part of an overlapping search area.¹

¹ To do justice to either identified groups of claims, it is respectfully submitted that it would be necessary to search in all classes and subclasses identified in numbered paragraphs 1 and 4 of the outstanding Official Action.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully traverse the outstanding Restriction Requirement on the grounds that a search and examination of the entire application would not place a *serious* burden on the Examiner.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Gregory J. Maier
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 25,599
Raymond F. Cardillo, Jr.
Registration No. 40,440

Customer Number
22850
Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 06/04)
GJM/RFC/RFF/ys

I:\ATTY\RFF\24S\240831\240831-RESTRICTION.DOC